DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 159 SP 008 945

AUTHOR Marshall, Hermine H.
TITLE Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs: Issues and Rationale.
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented to the Division of Teacher Education, Department of Education, University of California (Berleley, California, December 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation; Measurement; Objectives; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Performance Criteria; Problems; *Program Evaluation; Skills
IDENTIFIERS *University of California Berkeley

ABSTRACT

This paper looks at the issues and problems involved in the evaluation of competency-based teacher education programs. A major fallacy of CBTE programs is that they are based on the following implicit assumptions which have little theoretical or empirical support: (a) that there is much more agreement than the literature indicates on the goals and purposes of education, the competencies derived from these goals, and the timing and sequence of pupil competencies; and (b) that is a specific set of goals and objectives could be agreed upon, a valid set of corresponding teacher competencies could then be derived which promote these objectives. Evaluation of CBTE programs presents a second series of problems which include level of competence measured, the relationship of the measure to the particular competency, quality of the evidence, and isolation of factors which contribute to the achievement of the competencies. Despite these limitations, the University of California at Berkeley CBTE Programs will attempt to evaluate their programs in terms of the achievement of objectives and competencies, ongoing processes by which objectives are achieved, unplanned outcomes, and student background. This information will be analyzed and summarized in periodic reports. (PB)

ED102159

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS: ISSUES & RATIONALE

Hermine H. Marshall

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The purposes of this paper are (1) to examine some of the conceptual and practical issues involved in the evaluation of teacher education programs and (2) to present a framework and rationale for the procedures to be used in designing the evaluation of the Teacher Education Programs at University of California at Berkeley.

ISSUES & PROBLEMS

There are many issues and problems involved in the evaluation of Teacher Education. Only two types of issues will be considered in this paper: (1) issues inherent in competency based teacher education programs; and (2) problems relating to the measurement and assessment of competency based programs.

Problems of Competency Based Teacher Education Programs

A major fallacy of Competency Based Teacher Education Programs (CBTE) is that these programs are based on two types of implicit assumptions which have little theoretical or empirical support.

Assumptions regarding Theoretical Support

CBTE programs assume, first of all, that there is much more agreement than the literature indicates on (1) the goals and purposes of education, (2) the competencies derived from these goals, and (3) the timing and sequence of pupil competencies.

Goals and purposes of education. In their excellent analysis of the aims of education, Kohlberg and Mayer (1972) contrast three different

SP005 943

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

educational ideologies: (1) a "progressive" model whose goal is to promote the attainment of higher levels of cognitive, moral, and ego development; (2) a "romantic" model, which stresses mental health and happiness; and (3) a "cultural transmission" model whose purpose is to transmit the knowledge, skills, and rules of the culture. Each of these ideologies is based on a different set of values and on a different conception of what society needs and what is good for children. As a consequence, there is little commonality among the primary goals and objectives of the three models.

Competencies derived from goals. Advocates of each of these models would establish different types of educational programs based on the specific goals and objectives of the particular model of education. A different set of pupil competencies could then be derived from the particular model. Similarly, a specific set of teacher competencies could be generated appropriate to the particular model. These teacher competencies would be expected to promote the achievement of the particular pupil competencies. For example, where the transmission of such cultural skills as reading and computation is the purpose of education, the teacher should be competent primarily in teaching specific language, reading, and mathematical skills. In contrast, teachers whose aim is to promote the highest possible levels of cognitive, moral, and ego development--as described in the "progressive model"--would need to acquire a set of teaching competencies which would include sensitivity in detecting stages of development and strategies to promote higher levels of development for each individual. Measuring the achievement of these pupil competencies would provide evidence as to whether the objectives of the model had been met.

Thus, an application of Kohlberg and Mayer's review to the field of

competency based teacher education discussions that there are at least three viewpoints on the role of education, including three conceptions of the most important responsibilities for teachers to acquire in order to promote optimal learning for their pupils.

However, it might also be possible to achieve a number of goals and competencies five each of these models in an eclectic fashion. Such a eclectic model would be a fourth educational model and a fourth set of competencies. It is conceivable, furthermore, that additional models which do not necessarily overlap with the three above models could be generalized and that competencies could then be derived from the goals of these new models. Nevertheless, any such model requires an empirically derived rationale, based either on theory or on research.

[illegible] In addition to the different conceptions of pupil acquisitions and the corresponding teacher competencies required as evidence of achievement of the objectives of each model, a further point of disagreement among educators concerns the most appropriate timing and sequence for the achievement of particular competencies. Some educators have questioned the sequence of learning particular skills within present subject matter areas, grade to grade. Others, such as Bahner (1972) have questioned the efficiency of learning basic reading skills in the primary grades. Other programs contend that the refinement of competencies in reading and math skills by postponed until the intermediate grades might create. If these programs were successful, it would mean that teachers of primary and adolescent children would need to be competent in teaching basic reading and math skills and that teachers of young children should be competent in guiding exploratories and investigational activities rather than

[illegible]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(1) facilitate the use of the information in ongoing program improvement and (2) allow individuals involved in the programs to suggest areas for investigation in the subsequent sequence of data collection and feedback. Therefore, information will be reported informally to those involved in the particular programs as a part of a two-way process of continuing feedback and responses between the Evaluation Unit and Program Participants.

Formal reports will be made quarterly to the Teacher Education Division and to the CTPL in accordance with policies ultimately established.

Plans will be formulated for a follow-up of a representative sample of Program Graduates into their first few years of teaching--as required by the Ryan Act. Input into the design of the follow-up study will be sought from those involved in the programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Bloom, B.S. (ed.). Taxonomy of Education Objectives. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. N.Y.: McKay, 1956.

Borrowman, M.L. Evaluation and Intervention in Teacher Education. California Journal of Teacher Education, 1, 3-9, 1973 (Feb).

Borphy, J.E. & Everson, C.M. Low-inference observational coding measures and teacher effectiveness. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, 1973.

Charters, W.W., & Jones, J.E. On the risk of appraising non-events in program evaluation. Educational Researcher, 2, 5-7, 1973 (November).

Combs, A.W. The Professional Education of Teachers: A Perceptual View of Teacher Preparation. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1965.

Kohlberg, L. & Mayer, R. Development as the Aim of Education. Harvard Educ. Review, 42, 449-497, 1972.

Rohwer, W.D., Jr. Educational Inequality: Race is not the Problem. California Journal of Teacher Education, 1, 6-19, 1973.

Rosenshine, B. & Furst, N. The use of direct observation to study teaching. Travers, R.M.W. (ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Solomon, D. Progress Report: Individual Characteristics and Children's Performance in Varied Educational Settings. Rockville, Md., 1974.

Worthen, B.R. & Sanders, J.R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice, Worthington, Ohio: Chas. A. Jones, 1973.